

|   |                                      |                                     |  |
|---|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| <b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b><br>10/502,454 | <b>Applicant(s)</b><br>HJELT ET AL. |  |
|   | <b>Examiner</b><br>Punam Patel       | <b>Art Unit</b><br>2855             |  |

**All Participants:**

(1) Punam Patel (USPTO).

(2) Ralph D. Gelling (Applicant's Representative).

**Status of Application:** Amendment after Non-final

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 2 January 2008

**Time:** 3:10pm

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

N/A

Claims discussed:

49

Prior art documents discussed:

Wilda (WO 97/30356)

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

Wilda discloses a method of indicating a ruptured interconnecting element (#69), wherein the element (i) connects first (#68) and second (#88) body portions, (ii) breaks at a predetermined rupture point (pg. 4:16-17, wherein the area susceptible to rupture is read as the rupture point), and comprises a detector arrangement (pg. 4: 20-21 & pg. 5:5-7, the diagnostic conductor, #45, breaks). Also see Abstract. Wilda fails to teach a plurality of acceleration sensors, however multiple sensors provide greater sensitivity and can monitor a larger area, thus one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would be motivated to increase the number of acceleration sensors in general. However, there is no reasonable suggestion to modify Wilda to include multiple sensors, wherein at least two are oriented such that one sensor is more sensitive than the other to a force in one direction. See Examiner's Amendment enclosed herewith.